1

2

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

DELEGATE WHITE: Mr. Chairman, I have
listened for the past two hours, and I find the discussion a
bit confusing.

Great empahsis has been placed on directing the legislature to perform certain functions. Apparently many delegates here will reject this concept on the theory that certain things may not be enforceable, that they are mere expressions of high ideals that may not be attainable; but in looking at just one, which this same Assembly has passed, it began by saying that we shall have a post-audit, that a post-audit shall be provided. It shall be provided by the General Assembly. It shall, and when I go over the general provisions section, it also says that certain other things shall be. So I am wondering, are we fearful of attempting to protect our natural resources, our natural resources? Are we using the same arguments to reject something which is good, that we used to embrace something which we say is good, which requires the same kind of action on the part of the legislature? And I would like Chairman Boyer to epxlain to me if he sees a difference between the "shall" which requires the post-audit, and the "shall" which requires the State militia, and the "shall" which